

The Crumpling Transition Revisited

M. Baig^{a *} and D. Espriu^{b †}

^aDepartament de Física, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain.

^bD.E.C.M., Universitat de Barcelona, Diagonal, 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain.

The “crumpling” transition, between rigid and crumpled surfaces, has been object of much discussion over the past years. The common lore is that such transition should be of second order. However, some lattice versions of the rigidity term on fixed connectivity surfaces seem to suggest that the transition is of higher order instead. While some models exhibit what appear to be lattice artifacts, others are really indistinguishable from models where second order transitions have been reported and yet appear to have third order transitions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently we have learnt a good deal about gravity coupled to conformal matter with a central charge $c < 1$ [1]. However, after many years of hard work we still do not understand very well the behaviour of random surfaces in a more interesting range of dimensions. Sometime ago[2] it was pointed out that some of the difficulties encountered in quantizing two dimensional gravity could be overcome by adding to the area term (Nambu-Goto action) a piece proportional to the extrinsic curvature of the surface. This term is called rigidity and induces a correlation between the normals. In the continuum there is a unique operator of the right dimension. It is

$$\nabla_a n^\mu \nabla_a n^\mu \quad (1)$$

where n^μ is the normal vector to the surface. This operator is accompanied by a coupling constant κ whose renormalization group equation is known both in mean field[3] and in the one-loop approximation[4]. The theory is ultraviolet-free in $1/\kappa$ implying that at short distances κ grows and one expects the surface to be more rigid. The β -function found in [3,4] has no non-trivial zeroes, so the rigidity term is driven to zero in the infrared and the surface becomes highly convoluted over long distances.

This sort of behaviour has been observed in condensed matter physics in a number of systems. The pertinent relevant observable there is called the persistence length and it roughly corresponds to the average distance where the surface can be considered “flat”. However, many such systems seem to have a sharp transition at some finite value of κ where the surface sharply changes from being “crumpled” (with an infinite Hausdorff dimension, $d_H = \infty$) to “smooth” ($d_H \simeq 2$). At this point the persistence length increases dramatically and the specific heat shows a peak. Theoretical expectations[5] and numerical simulations seem to suggest that the transition may be of second order.

These results are clearly at odds with the results of [2–4]. This can probably be understood as follows. The calculation of the β -function in [5] assumes for the energy of the surface a combination of the bending (or rigidity) energy plus some stretching energy depending on two Lamé coefficients, as appropriate to crystalline membranes. This, however, has little to do with the action used in [2–4], namely the area action (for surfaces of fixed connectivity) or the more popular lattice version of the Polyakov action that includes a sum over triangulations[6] but keeps the intrinsic length of the triangles fixed. Both formulations contain, amongst other things, a sum over the conformal mode which is clearly absent in the Lamé approach. (Incidentally, at least in the continuum limit, Nambu-Goto and Polyakov

*Research supported by CICYT contract AEN90-0028

†Research supported by CICYT contract AEN90-0033 and CEE Science Twinning Grant SC1-0337-CA

formulations are equivalent even at the quantum level[7], not just classically. Of course it would be extremely important to understand this equivalence in lattice versions, simulations being much easier with fixed connectivity surfaces.)

Random surfaces seem to possess some non-universal features. For instance, the critical exponents associated to surfaces constructed on a hypercubic lattice[8] are certainly different from those obtained in a triangulated model[9]. It is quite possible that this non-universality is not accidental, but reflects some intrinsic disease of two dimensional gravity, such as, for instance, lack of renormalizability for $c > 1$. There are several possible ways to test this idea. One is, of course, to add copies of Ising models so that $c > 1$. In this conference we have heard a number of contributions in this direction. Another possibility is to perturb the action of Nambu-Goto strings and check for deviations. This provides an additional motivation to pay special attention to the crumpling transition.

2. RIGID SURFACE ACTIONS

We are thus confronted with a twofold task. On the one hand we want to construct models that correspond to “fluid” surfaces and not to crystalline ones. It is clear that dynamically triangulated surfaces are of this type. Surfaces with fixed connectivity may or may not. The simplest test is to check whether the β -function behaves for large values of the rigidity parameter as is supposed to do (fig. 1). Indirectly, this can be inferred from the existence or not of second order phase transitions.

Figure 1. Expected β -functions (for large values of κ) for crystalline (A) and fluid (B) surfaces.

Secondly, we want to see whether all the possible models have similar phase transitions. Should this not be the case it would be extremely difficult to select one in front of the others, of course. The natural consequence would be that some cut-off effects remain in two-dimensional gravity.

We shall work only with triangulated surfaces of fixed connectivity and will comment only at the end about dynamical triangulation models. We use a toroidal topology throughout and present results only for three embedding dimensions. As “area” term we can choose the area itself or the so called gaussian action[15] that consists of adding the lengths of the edges of the triangles squared. As for the rigidity term we have considered three different possibilities that we will denote S_1 , S_2 and S_3 .

S_1 is a popular choice, both in dynamical and fixed connectivity surfaces. It is

$$S_1 = \sum_{ij} (1 - \cos \theta_{ij}) \quad (2)$$

The sum extends to the angles formed by the normals to adjacent triangles. An innocent-looking variation of this action consists in expanding the cosinus and retaining only the first term

$$S_2 = \sum_{ij} \theta_{ij}^2 / 2 \quad (3)$$

Finally, we have also re-analyzed the action [10, 11]

$$S_3 = \sum_i \frac{1}{\Omega_i} \left(\sum_{j(i)} (x_j - x_i) \right)^2 \quad (4)$$

Needless to say that S_1 , S_2 and S_3 have the same naive continuum limit, namely (1). It has been pointed out that S_3 appears to have some lattice artifacts that yield “corrugated” surfaces in the smooth phase[12], but for all we know is perfectly alright in the crumpled phase and even around the phase transition. The authors of [11] concluded that this action has a third order crumpling transition.

We have not found any differences in the geometrical properties of the typical surfaces generated by S_1 and S_2 . Figure 2 shows two snapshots of a 16^2 surface first in the crumpled phase and

then in the smooth one with an action $\text{area}+S_1$. The most salient feature of the surface in the crumpled phase is, of course, the presence of the spikes. Without the presence of the extrinsic curvature these make the theory sick. Spikes have altogether disappeared in the smooth phase. Figure 3 shows the equivalent snapshots but now with an action $\text{gaussian}+S_2$. Since gaussian actions are known not to have spikes the surface is certainly smoother than before in the crumpled phase, pushing noticeably the crumpling transition towards lower values of κ .

Figure 2. Typical surfaces. $\text{Area}+S_1$

Figure 3. Typical surfaces. $\text{Gaussian}+S_2$

3. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We will report here only on the specific heat results from our Monte Carlo simulations of the above actions. One first observation is that the

equilibration and relaxation times are substantially longer for S_1 than for S_2 and S_3 . In all three cases there are crumpling transitions and around the critical point the relaxation times increase dramatically. In fact, it becomes crucial to have very good statistics and perform the binning in a systematic manner to get meaningful results. To compute the specific heat we have grouped the runs of the larger systems in bins of 10^5 , 2×10^5 , etc. sweeps until the specific heat levels off. Typically this happens around 4×10^5 sweeps. Then we accumulate typically five or six of such bins to assess the statistical errors. The rule of thumb is to run until the error bars around the phase transition are comparable to those of values of κ far from it. We have also used other methods, such as that of Ferrenberg and Swendsen (FS), but we have found much more difficult to assess the errors there and we have decided finally to present our results in a more old fashioned way. FS has been, however, very helpful to fix the length of the runs to guarantee good thermalization.

Figures 4 and 5 show the results for $\text{area}+S_1$ and $\text{area}+S_2$. The vertical scale is the same in both cases to ease the comparison. Figure 6 exhibits the specific heat plot for $\text{gauss}+S_2$. The shift in the location of the critical point and the very moderate growth are very much similar to $\text{area}+S_2$ and in sharp contrast to fig. 4. In fact, using a gaussian or an area action seems to matter little for the crumpling transition. In contrast fig. 4 that collects the results for S_1 definitely shows a more genuine second order behaviour with a clear growth of the specific heat.

We have collected in Table 1 our tentative conclusions. We have also included the results of [13] that consider a square well potential for the “area” term (tethered surfaces).

After re-analyzing the results of [11] in the three-dimensional case with the same binning criteria we have found plots for the specific heat which are totally compatible with the ones reported here for S_2 . We tentatively conclude that S_2 and S_3 lead, regardless of the form of the “area” action, to transitions which are most likely of higher order. This seems to agree with recent[14] results in dynamically triangulated sur-

Figure 4. Specific heat. Area+ S_1 Figure 6. Specific heat. Gaussian+ S_2

Table 1

Tentative type of phase transitions

	S_1	S_2	S_3
Area	2nd	3rd	3rd
Gaussian	2nd	3rd	—
Tethered	2nd	—	—

Figure 5. Specific heat. Area+ S_2

faces (with a cosine action, however), but leads to the distressing conclusion that there is some evidence for non-universality.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to J.Ambjorn, L.Jacobs, D.Johnston and J.F.Wheater for discussions.

REFERENCES

1. V.Knizhnik, A.Polyakov, A.Zamolodchikov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A3 (1988) 819; J.Distler, H.Kawai, Nucl. Phys B342 (1989) 342; E.Brezin, V.Kazakov, Phys. Lett. 236B (1990) 144.
2. A.Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B268 (1986) 406
3. F.Alonso, D.Espriu, Nucl. Phys. B283 (1987) 393
4. L.Peliti, S.Leibler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 1690; H.Kleinert, Phys. Lett. 174B (1986) 335
5. F.David, E.Gitter, Europhys. Lett. 5 (1988) 709
6. J.Ambjorn, B.Durhuus, J.Frohlich, P.Orland, Nucl. Phys. B270 (1986) 457; F.David, Nucl. Phys. B257 (1985) 543
7. T.Morris, Nucl. Phys. B341 (1990) 443
8. B.Durhuus, J.Frohlich, T.Jonsson, Nucl. Phys B240 (1984) 453
9. A.Billoire, D.Gross, E.Marinari, Phys. Lett. B139 (1984) 75
10. D.Espriu, Phys. Lett. 194B (1987) 271
11. M.Baig, D.Espriu, J.Wheater, Nucl. Phys. B314 (1989) 587
12. R.Harnish, J.Wheater, Nucl. Phys. B350 (1991) 861
13. Y.Kantor, D.Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 2774
14. A.Irbach, Proc. of Lattice '91, North Holland 1992.
15. J.Ambjorn, B.Durhuus, J.Frohlich, Nucl.

Phys B256 (1985) 433